Continuity and Accountability

Review of Placer County Grand Jury Reports from 2020-2021

Continuity and Accountability Review of Placer County Grand Jury Reports for 2020-2021

Summary

The primary duty of the Placer County Grand Jury is to investigate the functions of city and county government, schools, and special districts. Each year in June, the grand jury issues its final report which includes reports on inspections and investigations done during the term.

The report provides findings and recommendations for each investigation and inspection. Traditionally, a response report is issued in the November timeframe by the grand jury containing the responses from the investigated entities to their respective recommendations.

The 2021-2022 grand jury believes it is important to verify that the responses were compliant with Penal Code § 933.05, which outlines what each response is to include. The intent of this report is to confirm that entities comply with the penal code. The Placer County Grand Jury produced its first continuity report in June 2021. This is the grand jury's second continuity report.

Background

A continuity report is not required by the penal code. The grand jury reviews the responses and compiles the response report for publication. In a review of past Placer County Grand Jury final reports, it has been identified that several responses have not complied with Penal Code § 933.05. Since there has been no follow up to the responses, there has been no accountability for responding entities to comply with the penal code.

In previous years, the task of following up on responses that did not comply with the penal code has been taken on by the Placer County Grand Jurors' Association (PCGJA). This association is comprised of former grand jurors. Although the PCGJA assumed this task in the past, it has not been their focus in recent years. This resulted in many non-responsive recommendations not being addressed.

Methodology

The grand jury reviewed all the reports and responses to the 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury Final Report, which was published on June 16, 2021. The final report contained eight individual reports, with sixty-nine findings and forty-five recommendations. The current grand jury did not review nor have access to the prior grand jury's investigative evidence, which is confidential.

California Penal Code § 933.05

(emphasis added)

- (a) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Penal Code § 933, as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:
 - (1) The respondent agrees with the finding.
 - (2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding; in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons, therefore.
- (b) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Penal Code § 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:
 - (1) The recommendation **has been implemented**, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
 - (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.
 - (3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.
 - (4) The recommendation **will not be implemented** because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, **with an explanation**, therefore.
- (c) However, if a finding or recommendation of the grand jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the board of supervisors shall respond if requested by the grand jury, but the response of the board of supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision-making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.
- (d) A grand jury may request a subject person or entity to come before the grand jury for the purpose of reading and discussing the findings of the grand jury report that relates to that person or entity in order to verify the accuracy of the findings prior to their release.
- (e) During an investigation, the grand jury shall meet with the subject of that investigation regarding the investigation, unless the court, either on its own determination or upon request of the foreperson of the grand jury, determines that such a meeting would be detrimental.
- (f) A grand jury shall provide to the affected agency a copy of the portion of the grand jury report relating to that person or entity two working days prior to its public release and after the approval of the presiding judge. No officer, agency, department, or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to the public release of the final report.

Discussion

After research on a topic has been completed, the grand jury determines what facts of the investigation or inspection have been discovered. What is a fact? According to the California Grand Jury Association (CGJA), facts are:

- objective (neutral, unbiased, and not judgmental),
- not subject to interpretation,
- precise and accurate numbers, dates, amounts, etc., and
- verified not raw evidence, such as hearsay.

Once the grand jury has determined the facts they have discovered, findings are developed. The grand jury's findings are listed in each report and may or may not lead to a recommendation. What is a finding? Per the CGJA, findings:

- contain a conclusion or value judgment,
- express approval or disapproval,
- · show the need for action, and
- are clear and contain one main idea.

From the findings, recommendations are written, which are actions the grand jury concludes the investigated/inspected entities should implement. Recommendations should be SMART, meaning they must be **s**pecific, **m**easurable, **a**ctionable, **r**easonable, and **t**ime framed.

When the entities respond, they must follow Penal Code § 933.05, which specifically states what responses must include. The grand jury discovered that some of the respondents did not agree with several of the findings but did implement the recommendation the grand jury published.

The following charts provide the findings, recommendations, and responses to eight reports published by the Placer County Grand Jury in June 2021. Following each response in the charts is the 2021-2022 grand jury's evaluation of the response and its compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.

INDEPENDENT SPECIAL DISTRICTS AND THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Summary

special districts, school districts, and boards of supervisors, to have a prominent direct link to their agenda on their website's homepage. Included in the bill were other specific requirements which became mandatory after January 1, 2019. California enacted Assembly Bill 2257, codified in California Government Code § 54954.2, requiring all legislative bodies, such as city councils,

"shall clearly list contact information for the independent special district." 1, 2020. This law requires that absent a resolution declaring hardship every independent special district "shall maintain an Internet Web site" that In September 2018, California Senate Bill 929 was passed. This bill also updated some requirements for special districts and took effect on January

grand jury investigated only the thirty-eight independent special districts. located in, or associated with, Placer County as well as dependent special districts, non-profit, or County Service Area districts. For this report, the The grand jury investigated the special districts within the county for compliance with these laws. This report excludes any joint power authority

effect on January 1, 2020 requiring each special district to have a website. Of the remaining thirty-four, only fourteen (41%) of the special districts were fully compliant as of March 2021. The grand jury recommends the non-compliant special districts update their websites to be in compliance with the law. The grand jury found three districts did not have a website and one non-active district also did not have a website. California SB 929 went into

	Key to abbreviations use	d in the follo	Key to abbreviations used in the following chart for respondents:
AFD	Alta Fire Protection District	PCR	Placer County Resource Conservation District
ARD	Auburn Area Recreation & Parks District	PCW	Placer County Water Agency
CCD	Colfax Cemetery District	PHF	Placer Hills Fire Protection Agency
FUD	Foresthill Public Utility District	MM	Placer Mosquito & Vector Control District
HGD	Heather Glen Community Services District	WTS	Sierra Lakes County Water District
LCD	Lincohi Cemetery District	SPF	South Placer Fire Protection District
LAF	Placer County LAFCo	TPU	Tahoe City Public Utility District
MVW	Meadow Vista County Water District	ТСС	Tahoe City Cemetery District
WHW	Midway Heights County Water District	TFH	Tahoe Forest Hospital District
NFD	Newcastle Fire Protection District	TTA	Tahoe-Truckee Airport District
DSN	Northstar Community Services District	TRC	Tahoe Resource Conservation District
PFD	Penryn Fire Protection District	STT	Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation District
		TRI	Talmont Resort Improvement District

Districts are in full compliance with AB 2257 and SB 929.	Roseville Cemetery, South Placer Municipal Utility, and Tahoe Resource Conservation	North Taboe Fire Protection, North Taboe Public Utility, Olympic Valley Public Service,	Community District Services, Donner Summit Public Utility, Foresthill Fire Protection, McKinney Water, Newcastle- Rocklin-Gold Hill Complete	F1: Alpine Spring County Water, Auburn Cemetery, Auburn Valley Community Services, Christian Valley Park	Finding
					Agree with Finding
					Disagree Partially with Finding
					Disagree Completely with Finding
					Did Not Respond
				There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
					Agree with Recommendation
					Implemented Recommendation
					Will be Implemented with Date
					Further Study Needed
					Funding Needed
					Do Not Agree
					Will Not Implement
				No response was required from these entities.	Response

rez. reacher total community for zirces, Tahoe Forest Hospital, and Tahoe City Cemetery Districts do not have websites. They are non-compliant with both AB 2257 and SB 929.	Finding
	Agree with Finding
	Disagree Partially with Finding
5	Disagree Completely with Finding
פֿס	Did Not Respond
Heather Glen Community Services, Taboe Forest Hospital, and Taboe City Cemetery Districts create websites to be compliant with AB 2257 and SB 929.	Recommendation
	Agree with Recommendation
FD	Implemented Recommendation
	Will be Implemented with Date
	Further Study Needed
	Funding Needed
	Do Not Agree
	Will Not Implement
provided a compliant response but did respond that this recommendation has already been implemented. Tahoe City Cemetery District provided a compliant response and replied that this recommendation will not be implemented because they do not have staff to create or maintain a website. Heather Glen did not provide a compliant response, as they did not respond to the findings but they did not provide a compliant.	Response

	179
F3: Three districts, Colfax Cemetery, Penryn Fire Protection, and Talmont Resort Improvement Districts are noncompliant with AB 2257. They do not have a prominent, direct link to their current agenda; agendas are not searchable or downloadable.	Finding
	Agree with Finding
PFD	Disagree Partially with Finding
CCD	Disagree Completely with Finding
TRI	Did Not Respond
R2: By September 1, 2021, Colfax Gemetery, Penryn Fire Protection, and Talmont Resort Inprovement Districts update their website so they have a prominent, direct link to the current agenda and the agenda is searchable and downloadable to be compliant with AB 2257.	Recommendation
	Agree with Recommendation
TRI	Implemented Recommendation
	Will be Implemented with Date
	Further Study Needed
	Funding Needed
	Do Not Agree
CCD	Will Not Implement
Penryn Fire District provided a compliant response and responded that this recommendation has already been implemented. Colfax Cemetery District provided a compliant response and said this recommendation was not reasonable for them, as they do not have an independent web site. Talmont did not provide a compliant response to R2, noting that recommendation had already been implemented. These websites have been viewed. Colfax Cemetery District does not yet have an independent web site. Pemyn has a website, but as of this viewing, the link was not to the current agenda but instead a schedule of upcoming board meetings. Talmont's website is compliant.	Response

F4: Alta Fire Protection, Auburn FUD Area Recreation & Park LCD Foresthill Public Utility, Lincoln Cemetery #1, Meadow Vista County Water, Meadow Vista County Water, Newcastle Fire Protection, Northstar County Water, Newcastle Fire Protection, Northstar Fire Protection, Placer County Resource Conservation, Placer County Water Agency, Placer Hills Fire Protection, Placer Mosquito & Vector Control, Sierra Lakes County Water, South Placer Fire Protection, Sierra Lakes County Water, South Placer Fire Protection, Suburban Pines Community Services, Taboe City Public Utility, Tahoe-Truckee Airport, Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation, and Talmont Resort Improvement Districts do not have a prominent, direct link to the current agenda on the home page of their website.	Finding Agree with Finding
Z T	Disagree Partially with Finding
PCW A	Disagree Completely with Finding
AFD ARD ARD WHW	Did Not Respond
R3: By September 1, 2021. Alta Fire Protection. Auburn Area Recreation & Park, Foresthill Public Utility, Lincoln Cemetery #1, Meadow Vista County Water, Midway Heights County Water, Newcastle Fire Protection, Northstar Community Services, Placer County Resource Conservation, Placer County Water Agency, Placer Hills Fire Protection, Placer Mosquito & Vector Control, Sierra Lakes County Water, South Placer Fire Protection, Tahoe-Truckee Airport, and Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Districts create a prominent, direct link from their home page to their current agenda as required by AB 2257.	Recommendation
	Agree with Recommendation
AFD ARD FUD LCD MVD NSD PCR PHF PMV SPF SLW TPU TTA TTS	Implemented Recommendation
	Will be Implemented with Date
	Further Study Needed
	Funding Needed
	Do Not Agree
PCW	Will Not Implement
Foresthill Public Utility, Lincoln Cemetery #1, Meadow Vista County Water, Newcastle Resource Conservation, Northstar Community Services, Placer Resource Conservation District, Placer Hills Fire Protection, Placer Mosquito & Vector Control, Sierra Lakes County Water, South Placer Fire Protection, Simburban Pines Community Services, Tahoe City Public Utility, Tahoe-Truckee Airport, and Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Districts provided compliant responses and responded that this recommendation has already been implemented. Midway Heights County Water District provided a compliant response, noted this recommendation has been implemented and also disputes the requirement that the website be on a separately hosted agenda management platform.	Response

4	Finding
jd.	Agree with Finding
	Disagree Partially with Finding
·	Disagree Completely with Finding
	Did Not Respond
R3 (continued):	Recommendation
	Agree with Recommendation
	Implemented Recommendation
	Will be Implemented with Date
	Further Study Needed
	Funding Needed
	Do Not Agree
	Will Not Implement
Placer County Water District provided a compliant response but disagrees with the grand jury regarding a requirement to have an integrated agenda management platform. Suburban Pines, Talmont Resort Improvement, and Penryn Fire Protection Districts were not required to respond. Alta Fire provided a compliant response noting the recommendation had been implemented. Auburn Area Recreation & Park District did not provide a compliant response as they did not indicate agreement or disagreement with the findings, nor disagreement with the findings, nor did they indicate their implementation of the recommendation. These websites have been viewed and all were compliant as of this viewing, except the following districts: Midway Heights, Placer Hills Fire, and Placer Mosquito & Vector Control Districts' websites contained links to previous agenda, rather than the current meeting agenda. Newcastle Fire has a board meeting calendar but no links to their current agenda.	Response

F7: Placer County LAFCo does not have an up-to-date listing of the independent special districts with contact information.	F6: A lack of consistency in independent special district websites makes locating similar information difficult and time consuming for the user.	F5: The LAFCo website, which is hosted by Placer County, is difficult to locate. Placer County LAFCo does not have an independent website.	Finding Agree with Finding Disagree Partially with Finding
LAF			Disagree Completely with Finding
	4 = 0 = =	4 5 6 1 7	Did Not Respond
R6: By September 1, 2021, Placer County LAFCo will establish a plan for each independent special district to update their contact and board information on a yearly basis each January, beginning in January, beginning in January 2022. The document with the information will be placed on the LAFCo website.	F5: By September 1, 2021, Placer County LAFCo will establish and manage their own up-to-date website.	R4: By September 1, 2021, Placer County LAFCo will establish and manage their own up-to-date website.	Recommendation
			Agree with Recommendation
			Implemented Recommendation
			Will be Implemented with Date
LAF		LAF	Further Study Needed
	ē	- 6	Funding Needed
			Do Not Agree
		L	Will Not Implement
Placer County LAFCo provided a compliant response. While LAFCo agrees that regular updates should be done, much of the information comes in throughout the year. Staff is in process of preparing updates, but having an updated website will be a great help.	Placer County LAFCo believes this is a duplicate recommendation.	Placer County LAFCo provided a compliant response. While LAFCo agrees with this recommendation, the timeframe is not realistic. LAFCo needs to be fully staffed with a web designer to comply.	Response

F10: Colfax Cemetery, South Placer Fire Protection, and Tahoe Resource Conservation District websites do not comply with SB 929.	F9: Placer County LAFCo does not keep records of the ethics training, completed by board members of the districts they oversee.	F8: Suburban Pines Community Services District is a non-active district	Finding
	LAF		Agree with Finding
		LAF	Disagree Partially with Finding
CCD		LAF	Disagree Completely with Finding
			Drd Nor Respond
R9: By September 1, 2021, Colfax Cemetery District will add contact information to its web site to be compliant with SB 929.	R8: By September 1, 2021, Placer County LAFCo will establish and maintain a list of the ethics training completed by each independent special district board member.	R7: By September 1, 2021, Placer County LAFCo will take the necessary steps to dissolve Suburban Pines Community Services District and incorporate the maintenance of the six fire hydrants to another entity.	Recommendation
			Agree with Recommendation
		Ē.	Implemented Recommendation
			Will be Implemented with Date
		LAF	Further Study Needed
,			Funding Needed
			Do Not Agree
CCD	LAF		Will Not Implement
Colfax Cemetery District provided a compliant response and said this recommendation was not reasonable for them, as they do not have an independent web site.	Placer County LAFCo provided a compliant response. Each agency is required to keep their own list of ethics training completed. It is not reasonable to recommend Placer County LAFCo to maintain a duplicate list of this training.	Placer County LAFCo provided a compliant response. Suburban Pines consists of maintaining six fire hydrants and cannot be dissolved until a successor agency can be identified to maintain the hydrants.	Response

F10 (continued): Colfax Cemetery, South Placer Fire Protection, and Taboe Resource Conservation District websites do not comply with SB 929.	F10 (continued): Colfax Cemetery, South Placer Fire Protection, and Tahoe Resource Conservation District websites do not comply with SB 929.	Finding
	SPF	Agree with Finding
TRC		Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
		Did Not Respond
R11: By September 1, 2021, Tahoe Resource Conservation District will list their board members on its website.	R10: By September 1, 2021, South Placer Fire Protection District will add a contact email address to its website to be compliant with SB 929.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
TRC	SPF	Implemented Recommendation
		Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
		Do Not Agree
		Will Not Implement
Tahoe Resource Conservation District provided a compliant response. This recommendation has been implemented. Tahoe Resource Conservation's website has been viewed and it does contain a link to a list of its board members.	South Placer Fire Protection District provided a compliant response. This recommendation has been implemented. South Placer's website has been viewed and it does now contain a clickable email address.	Response

COUNTY LACK OF COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY IN HOUSING THE HOMELESS OF PLACER

Summary

across the state which impacts local resources. Homelessness in California, as well as Placer County, is no longer confined to the big cities. It is in both urban and rural communities

protection, and limited resources and social services. problems. Health problems among homeless persons result from various factors, such as lack of access to adequate food and Homelessness is closely connected to declines in physical and mental health; homeless persons experience high rates of health

of funds awarded to nonprofit organizations selected to provide housing for the Placer County homeless and mentally ill. communication and transparency, there have been questions and concerns that reference the perceived improper use and efficacy Human Services of the Placer County Whole Person Care Pilot program was also a concern raised by citizens. In addition to regarding the Placer County Whole Person Care Pilot program. A perceived lack of oversight provided by Placer County Health and have been critical and outspoken regarding a lack of communication and transparency by the Placer County Board of Supervisors the homeless. However, this report focuses only on the Placer County Whole Person Care Pilot program. Some Placer County citizens The grand jury recognizes there are many types of housing and programs used by county, state, and federal governments to house

the purchase of the homes pursuant to contracts SCN 102 104 and SCN 102 143.	F6: The Gathering Inn and Advocates for Mentally III Housing, Inc. did not openly communicate with the neighborhood residents prior to	FIS: The agencies, both public and nonprofit, elected not to disclose home purchases until after client move-in to exclude community input.	F4: Placer County Health and Human Services has no single division or department charged with overseeing all county homeless programs.	Finding
nes 2143.	ind III enly	oublic not to ss until sxclude	h and X single charged nty	
				Agree with Finding
	×	×		Disagree Partially with Finding
	×	×		Disagree Completely with Finding
				Did Not Respond
initiated open communication initiated open communication with neighbors surrounding all permanent supportive homes, as required by their contract.	R4: By October 1, 2021, Placer County Health and Human Services will verify that The Gathering Inn and Advocates for Mentally Ill Housing, Inc. have	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	R3: By January 1, 2022, Placer County Health and Human Services will take steps to add a division or reorganize the department, to create a single designated division to manage all homeless programs in the county.	Recommendation
				Agree with Recommendation
				Implemented Recommendation
	×			Will be Implemented with Date
			×	Further Study Needed
				Funding Needed
				Do Not Agree
				Will Not Implement
before October I, 2021.	Placer County Health and Human Services has provided a compliant response. The recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the near future and		Placer County Health and Human Services has provided a compliant response. This recommendation requires further analysis. Due to the complexity of this recommendation, a timeline for follow up is unknown at this time.	Response

F9: The funding received for the housing program provided homes to thirty-five county citizens.	F8: The number of calls to law X enforcement about Placer County Whole Person Care Pilot program houses were much lower than perceived by the public.	F7: The county did not effectively communicate that the permanent supportive housing for six or fewer residents is permitted in all zones allowing residential use.	Finding Agree with Finding
×		×	Disagree Partially with Finding
×		×	Disagree Completely with Finding
			Did Not Respond
There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
			Agree with Recommendation
			Implemented Recommendation
			Will be Implemented with Date
			Further Study Needed
		1:	Funding Needed
			Do Not Agree
			Will Not Implement
			Response

LINCOLN REGIONAL AIRPORT

Summary

LRA must substantially increase the earnings of the two primary revenue streams, hangar rentals and fuel sales. operating model. Following the audit by the State of California Joint Legislative Audit Committee, the City of Lincoln acknowledged Over the last twenty years, the Lincoln Regional Airport (LRA) has struggled financially under city ownership and the current the airport's annual deficit. To correct this deficit, the city agreed to fund the airport with a formal interfund loan. In the future, the

annual deficit, financially and structurally. nor experience in aviation, marketing, sales, or airport business development. City management has been reluctant to address this lack of expertise because of the potential cost. As a result of not addressing this critical need, the airport operates at a substantial The grand jury determined that no one in LRA operations, management, or city leadership has a background in airport management

documents since the 2007 Lincoln Regional Airport Master Plan. Perhaps the most serious oversight of Lincoln's approach to the management of the LRA is having no current master plan An airport master plan represents a blueprint of an airport's current, intermediate, and long-term infrastructure development.

outside standard fiduciary practices. grant funds from other government entities. However, LRA's indebtedness to the general fund is structural and long term and is county's general fund. Typically, indebtedness is periodic and short-term in nature, such as capital payments due before receiving The grand jury interviewed other regional aviation managers to determine if it is typical for an airport to be in debt to a city or

F3: The Lincoln Regional Airport does not have a separate audited annual financial report for the airport operation as an Enterprise Fund requires.	F2: The Lincoln Regional Airport does not have ongoing efforts to evaluate the airport's competitiveness in the marketplace and maximize revenue opportunities, such as fuel pricing and development of vacant airport land.	F1: The Lincoln Regional Airport does not have a general aviation manager nor does any city management professional responsible for the airport have an aviation management background.	Finding Agree with Finding
			Disagree Partially with Finding
			Disagree Completely with Finding
×	×	×	Did Not Respond
R3: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will produce a separate audited annual financial report for the airport operation as an Enterprise Fund requires.	R2: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will review current airport leases for opportunities to increase rents to the maximum amount allowable by the terms of the contracts until rentals reflect market value.	R1: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will complete and adopt a feasibility study to evaluate hiring a general aviation manager with aviation management experience and/or American Association of Airport Executives certification.	Recommendation
	5		Agree with Recommendation
			Implemented Recommendation
			Will be Implemented with Date
15			Furthér Study Needed
			Funding Needed
×	×	×	Do Not Agree
×	×	×	Will Not Implement
The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. Per City of Lincoln, this recommendation is not consistent with accounting principles and there is no reason to conduct a separate audit.	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln 2019 market survey, their rates and leases have been adjusted and do not require further adjustment.	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln, there is insufficient revenue to support a full time manager. The city does not believe such a position is necessary.	Response

F5: The Lincoln Regional Airport fuel prices are not regularly adjusted to market prices.	F4: An updated version of the Lincoln Regional Airport Master Plan of 2007 has not been published.	Finding Agree with Finding
		Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
×	×	Did-Not Respond
R5: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will implement weekly fuel price adjustments reflecting current market rates.	R4: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will publish an updated Lincoln Regional Airport Master Plan to include a blueprint of the airport's current, intermediate, and long-term infrastructure development, as well as a financial plan supporting a sustainable revenue stream commensurate with the capital expenditures necessary for planned airport evolution.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
	×	Implemented Recommendation
	1	Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
×		Do Not Agree
×	u ca a ca	Will Not Implement
The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln, fuel prices will only be adjusted when fuel is purchased, which occurs infrequently.	The City of Lincoh did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoh, this recommendation was already implemented as part of its annual capital improvement process completed in coordination with the FAA. The City of Lincoh has published a report entitled "Airport Layout Plan Update Narrative Report" which is available online.	Response

F7: The City of Lincoln does not perform a regular evaluation of the airport's fuel sales contract.	F6: The Lincoln Regional Airport loan agreement of \$4.95 million from the City of Lincoln General Fund formalizes repayment of past operating deficits with a sixty-year repayment schedule.	Finding
		Agree with Finding
		Disagree Partially with Finding
	***************************************	Disagree Completely with Finding
×	×	Did Not Respond
R7: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will solicit compelitive bids for airport fuels, contracts, and services.	R6: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will evaluate and restructure the Lincoln Regional Airport's 60-year loan amortization to align with the physical, functional, and economic obsolescence of airport infrastructure and equipment.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
		Implemented Recommendation
		Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
×	×	Do Not Agree
×	×	Will Not Implement
The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Competitive bids have been solicited twice within last 5 years and vendors indicated Lincoln doesn't sell enough fuel for the airport fueling to be a viable private business opportunity. Also, Lincoln currently receives full sale related revenue in excess of what would be received from a fuel flowage fee and/or lease of the fuel system.	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln, the airport's interfund loan is consistent with the city's interfund loan policy, legal revenue restrictions and requirements and was thoroughly verted by legal counsel, the State of CA's Joint Legislative Audit Team, staff and city counsel.	Response

F9: The Lincoln Regional Airport has no airport emergency plan, safety program, or first responder emergency training exercises.	F8: The Lincoln Regional Airport management staff have no relationships with airport related industry associations or professional development organizations that provide updates to industry best practices.	Finding
		Agree with Finding
2		Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
×	×	Did Not Respond
R9: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln shall implement plans and policies for safety and emergency response training drills at the Lincoln Regional Airport.	R8: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will identify common airport related industry associations and professional development programs to expand and enhance vendor relationships, recruitment, and develop industry best practices.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
		Implemented Recommendation
		Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
×	×	Do Not Agree
×	×	Will Not Implement
The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln, responses to major emergencies at the airport are carried out pursuant to Lincoln's Emergency Operations Plan which addresses roles and responsibilities during an emergency response.	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. City of Lincoln currently participates in Association of CA Airports and National Business Aviation Association. Conferences have not been held recently due to pandemic.	Response

PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF PLACER COUNTY: A RESOURCE FOR ALL

Summary

compared to that of an ignorant nation." discovery. This is still true of libraries today. In 1995, Walter Cronkite said, "Whatever the cost of our libraries, the price is cheap knowledge of the known world. Libraries have propelled intellectual growth, broadened shared understanding, and encouraged new helped shape our civilization. Over 2000 years ago, the Great Library of Alexandria, Egypt, collected and held the bulk of the Throughout history, libraries and their accumulated knowledge have improved our communities, strengthened literacy, and even

Roseville, which has three branches. public library system, consisting of nine branches. Additionally, there are municipally operated libraries in Loomis, Lincoln, and library systems located within the county. There are fourteen public libraries located in Placer County. The county operates its own The 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury agreed with this sentiment and sought to understand the current status of the various

staffing and public outreach could be addressed. typical year, however, funding is the most pressing need for each system. With sufficient funding, budget concerns such as adequate COVID-19 restrictions on the function and operation of each library were frustrating to both the public and the library staff. In a While each library has its own issues and concerns, a common denominator this year was the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19). The

They provide both learning opportunities and personal enrichment to their patrons and up-to-date services via user friendly and passionate employees. Although there are areas for improvement, all the libraries in Placer County fulfill their intended purpose. accessible technology. The grand jury is impressed by the state of the libraries in Placer County. The libraries are staffed by knowledgeable, dedicated, and

			Roseville Public Library	R
Loomis Library and Community Learning Center	Lo		Lincoln Public Library	Li
Placer County Library	P		Placer County Board of Supervisors	BoS
Key to abbreviations used in the following chart for respondents:	e tol	nth	Key to abbreviations used in	

F3: A citizen of Placer County who wishes to borrow across all county library systems must have four separate library cards.	F2: The Placer County Library system would benefit from increased promotion and community outreach to increase both membership and public awareness of library services.	F1: All the libraries in Placer County provide similar basic services to their patrons, including resource lending, computer use, and programming for children and adults.	Finding
P R Lo BoS	P BoS	P R Lo BoS	Agree with Finding
			Disagree Partially with Finding
			Disagree Completely with Finding
		114	Did Not Respond
R2: By January 1, 2022, Placer County Library, Roseville Public Library, Lincoln Public Library, and Loomis Library and Community Learning Center will work together to develop a single county-wide library card.	R1: By January 1, 2022, Placer County Library will develop a promotion and outreach plan to increase membership and circulation.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
			Agree with Recommendation
			Implemented Recommendation
	ים		Will be Implemented with Date
			Further Study Needed
			Funding Needed
			Do Not Agree
P R Li Lo			Wtll Not Implement
Placer County, Roseville, Lincoln and Loomis libraries all provided compliant responses. The responses all indicated this recommendation was discussed among all four library systems and will not be implemented due to the costs of implementation. All library systems have indicated a commitment to pursuing additional interlibrary cooperation in the future.	Placer County Library provided a compliant response. Their response indicated the recommendation would be implemented beginning in December 2021.	All the libraries in Placer County and the Placer County Board of Supervisors agree with this finding.	Response

F5: The Placer County Library and Roseville Public Library do not own their own web domains separate from their county/citymanaged website.	F4: The Placer County Library, Roseville Public Library, and Lincoln Public Library have websites that are incorporated into their respective county/city websites.	Finding
P R Li BoS	P R Li BoS	Agree with Finding
	(%)	Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
		Did Not Respond
R3 Continued: By November 1, 2021, Placer County Library, Roseville Public Library, and Lincoln Public Library will each develop and manage their own independent website.	R3: By November 1, 2021, Placer County Library, Roseville Public Library, and Lincoln Public Library will each develop and manage their own independent website.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
		Implemented Recommendation
P	P	Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
		Do Not Agree
R Li	R	Will Not Implement
Placer County Libraries provided a compliant response, indicating this recommendation will be implemented beginning December 2022 if sufficient funding is available. Roseville Public Library and Lincoln Public Library also provided a compliant response, which indicated this recommendation will not be implemented as it is not warranted or reasonable.	Placer County Libraries provided a compliant response, indicating this / recommendation will be implemented beginning December 2022 if sufficient funding is available. Roseville Public Library and Lincoln Public Library also provided a compliant response, which indicated this recommendation will not be implemented as it is not warranted or reasonable.	Response

F7: Placer County Library system faces greater staffing challenges compared to the other library systems, especially considering the number of branches, territory covered, and that 25 percent of their allocated headcount is used for administrative support.	F6: The Placer County Library system's nine branches serve approximately half of the population of Placer County and over 95 percent of the county's total territory, resulting in branches over ninety-five miles apart, which strains the library's current staffing resources.	Finding
P BoS	P BoS	Agree with Finding
		Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
	D 1	Did Not Respond
R4: By October 1, 2021, Placer County Library will conduct an internal review to determine appropriate staffing levels, present a report on their findings to the Placer County Board of Supervisors, and post the report on the Placer County Library website.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
P BoS		Implemented Recommendation
		Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
•		Funding Needed
		Do Not Agree
V = 1 0 = 0 O =		Will Not Implement
Placer County Libraries and the Placer County Board of Supervisors provided compliant responses. Both responses indicate this recommendation has already been implemented in the traditional budgeting process and an independent consultant will be sourced.		Response

F10: In the fall of 2021, Lincoln Public Library will be operating as the school library for Twelve Bridges High School as well as the public library.	F8: Placer County Library system does not produce a newsletter or utilize other means of regular communication with its patrons. F9: Roseville Public Library system is consolidated within the Parks & Recreation Department.	F7 Continued: Placer County Library system faces greater staffing challenges compared to the other library systems, especially considering the number of branches, territory covered, and that 25 percent of their allocated headcount is used for administrative support.	Finding
드	P BoS	P BoS	Agree with Finding
			Disagree Partially with Finding
			Disagree Completely with Finding
			Did Not Respond
There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding. There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	R5: By January 1, 2022, the Placer County Board of Supervisors will review the Placer County Library staffing report and take appropriate action.	Recommendation
			Agree with Recommendation
		BoS	Implemented Recommendation
		**************************************	Will be Implemented with Date
			Further Study Needed
			Funding Needed
			Do Not Agree
			Will Not Implement
		Placer County Board of Supervisors provided a compliant response. This recommendation has been implemented. The Library Administration was able to present their staffing and budgetary needs to the County Executive's fiscal team for their consideration in the FY 2021-22 budget creation. CEO staff makes recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.	Response

F12: Due to the incident in 2019, the Placer County Library system has recently taken a more complete and up-to-date approach to handling security at all locations.	F11: Loomis Library and Community Learning Center provides innovative services to their patrons including a seed library and maker space for children.	Finding
ъ	Lo	Agree with Finding
		Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
		Did Not Respond
There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
		Implemented Recommendation
		Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
		Do Not Agree
		Will Not Implement
		Response

PLACER COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY: ANNUAL INSPECTION REPORT 2020-2021

Summary

The Placer County Grand Jury is responsible for inquiring into the conditions of all public detention facilities, as authorized by California Penal Code § 919(b). The grand jury completed an inspection of the Placer County Juvenile Detention Facility (PCJDF) on December 1, 2020, with coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) restrictions in place. The grand jury found the PCJDF to be secure and well-maintained, with dedicated, knowledgeable, and helpful staff.

F1: The Placer County Juvenile X Detention Facility is appropriately staffed with knowledgeable and well-trained personnel. F2: The youths at the facility are provided appropriate programs and educational opportunities, despite COVID-19 restrictions.	Agree with Finding
	Disagree Partially with Finding Disagree Completely with Finding
	Did Not Respond
There was no recommendation associated with this finding. There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
	Agree with Recommendation
	Implemented Recommendation
	Will be Implemented with Date
	Further Study Needed
	Funding Needed
	Do Not Agree
	Will Not Implement
	Response

F4: While initial funding was provided for the Placer Youth Center program, ongoing funding is necessary for its success.	F3: The implementation of the Placer Youth Center pilot program has been placed on hold due to the pandemic and is expected to be beneficial when COVID-19 restrictions are lifted.	Finding
×	×	Agree with Finding
		Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
	D) 1	Did Not Respond
R1: By September 1, 2021, the Placer County Board of Supervisors commit to funding the Placer Youth Center in future budgets.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
×		Implemented Recommendation
		Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
		Do Not Agree
		Will Not Implement
The Placer County Board of Supervisors provided a compliant response. The FY 2021-2022 adopted budget includes the funding for the Placer Youth Center program and is planned to be included in future year's budgets as well.		Response

PLACER COUNTY JAILS AND HOLDING FACILITIES: INSPECTION REPORT 2020-2021

SummaryThis report summarizes the Placer County Grand Jury inspections of four holding facilities and three Placer County jails.

The grand jury investigated the booking and jail services contract between Nevada and Placer Counties for the Placer County Sheriff's Tahoe Substation.

The grand jury found the inspected jails and holding facilities to be secure, orderly, and well-run.

F2: The cost to use the Tahoe Substation for overnight holdings would exceed the current contract for jail services provided by Nevada County.	F1: The Placer County Sheriff's Office has mitigated the overnight detention issue at the Tahoe Substation through their contract with Nevada County.	Finding
Tahoe th the I services unty.	Sheriff's e at the agh their ounty.	£
×	×	Agree with Finding
		Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
		Did Not Respond
There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
		Implemented Recommendation
		Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
		Do Not Agree
		Will Not Implement
¥)		Response

0 8 5 7	s Transfer	S = C S E	< 5 m m ml	
F6. Environmental and budgetary concerns are factors affecting construction progress of the Tahoe Justice Center.	F5: In 2019, the Placer County Board of Supervisors allocated funds for the proposed Tahoe Justice Center, with construction starting in 2024/2025.	F4: Placer County Sheriff's Tahoe Substation is a dilapidated building that cannot be improved economically for services as a certified jail.	F3: The average booking fee at the Nevada County Truckee Jail for the 2019-2020 fiscal year was \$3,382.32 per arrestee.	Finding
×	×	×	×	Agree with Finding
	1)			Disagree Partially with Finding
				Disagree Completely with Finding
				Did Not Respond
There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	R4: The Board of Supervisors will commit to following the timeline for the completion of the Tahoe Justice Center by 2024/2025.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
				Agree with Recommendation
				Implemented Recommendation
	×			Will be Implemented with Date
				Further Study Needed
				Funding Needed
				Do Not Agree
				Will Not Implement
	The Placer County Board of Supervisors provided a compliant response. The recommendation will not be implemented as stated. The project is on the capital improvement list and is in the design phase now with completion set for 2026.			Response

F7: The security camera system at the Auburn Historic Courthouse facility is inadequate.	F7: The security camera system at the Auburn Historic Courthouse facility is inadequate.	Finding
×	×	Agree with Finding
		Disagree Partially with Finding
		Disagree Completely with Finding
		Did Not Respond
R2: By October 1, 2021, the court administrative officer and county executive officer will present to the Board of Supervisors a request for funding to replace poorly functioning security cameras and add cameras in key locations at the Auburn Historic Courthouse.	R1: By September 1, 2021, the court administrative officer and county executive officer will complete an evaluation of the security camera system at the Auburn Historic Courthouse.	Recommendation
		Agree with Recommendation
×		Implemented Recommendation
	×	Will be Implemented with Date
		Further Study Needed
		Funding Needed
		Do Not Agree
		Will Not Implement
The court administrative officer and county executive officer provided compliant responses. The recommendation will be implemented but neither the court administrative officer nor county executive officer will be involved in the evaluation of the security camera system.	The court administrative officer and county executive officer provided compliant responses. The recommendation will be implemented but neither the court administrative officer nor county executive officer will be involved in the evaluation of the security camera system.	Response

F7: The security camera system at the Auburn Historic Courthouse facility is inadequate.	Finding
×	Agree with Finding
	Disagree Partially with Finding
	Disagree Completely with Finding
	Did Not Respond
R3: By March 1, 2022, the court administrative officer and county executive officer will oversee the new security camera system installation at the Auburn Historic Courthouse.	Recommendation
	Agree with Recommendation
×	Implemented Recommendation
	Will be Implemented with Date
	Further Study Needed
	Funding Needed
	Do Not Agree
a	Will Not Implement
The court administrative officer and county executive officer provided compliant responses. The recommendation will be implemented but neither the court administrative officer nor county executive officer will be involved in the evaluation of the security camera system.	Response

PREPAREDNESS OF PLACER COUNTY FOR THE NOVEMBER 2020 GENERAL ELECTION

Summary

In these unprecedented times of COVID-19, the State of California took steps to ensure every citizen could safely vote in the November 2020 general election. The passing of Assembly Bill 860 and Senate Bill 423 made California a vote-by-mail state for the election and report the changes being made to ensure a successful election. upcoming election. The grand jury investigated the Placer County Elections Office and their readiness to conduct a vote-by-mail

public agencies to support the election.	F3: Placer County Elections Office staff works with other	F2: Placer County Elections Office is complying with the requirements of SB 423 and AB 860.	F1: Placer County Elections staff are committed to ensuring that registered voters have the opportunity to vote and all ballots are properly collected, counted, and secured.	Finding
	×	×	×	Agree with Finding
				Disagree Partially with Finding
				Disagree Completely with Finding
				Did Nor Respond
c	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	R1: Placer County Elections staff should develop additional processes for maintaining the accuracy of the voter rolls.	Recommendation
			×	Agree with Recommendation
			×	Implemented Recommendation
				Will be Implemented with Date
				Further Study Needed
				Funding Needed
				Do Not Agree
			98	Will Not Implement
			Placer County Elections provided a compliant response. This recommendation has already been implemented and will continue to be an area for ongoing improvements.	Response

F8: Lake Tahoe voters using the US Postal Service could have their ballots delayed getting to the Auburn Elections Office.	F7: If voting in person, individuals will have four days to vote at a Voter Service Center, instead of just one day at a precinct.	F6: Ballots are collected, verified, and counted beginning October 5, 2020, but are not tabulated until November 3 after 8:00 p.m.	F5: There has been an expansion from three days to seventeen days for the collection, verifying, and counting ballots.	F4: Placer County Elections staff have planned, developed processes, and invested in supplies to safeguard the health and safety of both voters and poll workers.	Finding
×	×	×	×	×	Agree with Finding
					Disagree Partially with Finding
					Disagree Completely with Finding
					Did Not Respond
There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
					Agree with Recommendation
					Implemented Recommendation
					Will be Implemented with Date
					Further Study Needed
					Funding Needed
Y					Do Not Agree
					Will Not Implement
	æ				Response

F12: The full cost for the X November 2020 election is unknown.	T10: There will be additional X drop box locations for the public to return their vote-by-mail ballots if they choose not to use the US Postal Service. F11: The live real-time X connection between the VSC locations and the voter registration database has not been previously used.	F9: Voters placing a stamp on X their return ballot envelope could have their ballots delayed getting to the Auburn Elections Office.	Finding Agree with Finding
			Disagree Partially with Finding
			Disagree Completely with Finding
			Did Not Respond
R2: By March 1, 2021, the Placer County Registrar of Voters will provide to the 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury a written summary that documents all costs associated with the November 2020 general election.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding. There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	Recommendation
			Agree with Recommendation
			Implemented Recommendation
×			Will be Implemented with Date
			Further Study Needed
			Funding Needed
			Do Not Agree
			Will Not Implement
Placer County Registrar of Voters provided a compliant response. This recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future. Vendor receipts have been submitted so documented costs for November 2020 election will be submitted by March 1, 2021.			Response

F13: As a result of SB 423 and AB 860, Placer County Elections Office has developed many new processes. The efficacy of these processes will not be known fully until after the November 2020 election.	Finding
×	Agree with Finding
	Disagree Partially with Finding
	Disagree Completely with Finding
	Did Not Respond
R3: By March 1, 2021, the Placer County Registrar of Voters will provide the 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury a written debrief of issues/problems encountered during the November 2020 general election as well as what the department did to resolve the issues/problems and what the department has learned from this experience, both positive and negative.	Recommendation
	Agree with Recommendation
	Implemented Recommendation
×	Will be Implemented with Date
	Further Study Needed
	Funding Needed
	Do Not Agree
	Will Not Implement
Placer County Registrar of Voters provided a compliant response. This recommendation has not yet been implemented because as of yet, staff has not had time to examine all of the challenges that arose during the November 2020 election, but should be able to provide by July 2021.	Response

Continuity and Accountability: Review of Placer County Grand Jury Reports from 2019-2020

Summary

during the term. districts. Each year in June, the grand jury issues its final report which includes reports on inspections and investigations done The primary duty of the Placer County Grand Jury is to investigate the functions of city and county government, schools, and special

recommendations. in the November timeframe by the grand jury containing the responses from the investigated entities to their respective The report provides findings and recommendations for each investigation and inspection. Traditionally, a Response Report is issued

outlines what each response is to include. The intent of this report is to confirm that entities comply with the Penal Code. The Placer County Grand Jury has not produced a continuity report in the past. The 2020-2021 grand jury believes it is important to verify that the responses were compliant with Penal Code § 933.05, which

F1: Placer County Grand Jury has not written a continuity report in previous years.	Finding
	Agree with Finding
	Disagree Partially with Finding
	Disagree Completely with Finding
a = =	Did Not Respond
RI: Future Placer County Grand Juries shall continue to produce a continuity report each year.	Recommendation
	Agree with Recommendation
	Implemented Recommendation
	Will be Implemented with Date
	Further Study Needed
	Funding Needed
	Do Not Agree
	Will Not Implement
2021-2022 Placer County Grand Jury is preparing a continuity report for the current term.	Response

	627		F2: Five responses were not compliant with Penal Code § 933.05.	Finding
				Agree with Finding
				Disagree Partially with Finding
				Disagree Completely with Finding
				Did Not Respond
R5: By September 1, 2021, Placer County Sheriff will respond to the two recommendations from the 2019-2020 report with responses that are compliant with Penal Code § 933.05.	R4: By September 4, 2021, Rocklin School District will respond to the recommendation from the 2019-2020 report with a response that is compliant with Penal Code 933.05.	R3: Future Placer County Grand Juries should require respondents whose response is found to be non-compliant with Penal Code § 933.05 to provide the grand jury with an updated response that is compliant.	R2: Future Placer County Grand Juries should follow up with any response that is not compliant with Penal Code § 933.05.	Recommendation
	×			Agree with Recommendation
	×			Implemented Recommendation
×				Will be Implemented with Date
				Further Study Needed
				Funding Needed
	·			Do Not Agree
		1,4		Will Not Implement
Placer County Sheriff's Office did not provide a compliant response. While they have not yet implemented the recommendations, they plan to do so in the future, but did not provide an implementation date.	Rocklin School District provided a compliant response and has implemented the recommendation.	2021-2022 Placer County Grand Jury has followed up on non-compliant responses.	2021-2022 Placer County Grand Jury has followed up on non-compliant responses.	Response

F5: Tahoe-Truckee School District did not respond to the grand jury.	F4: Bowman Charter School District website is not currently compliant with AB 2257.	F3: Alta-Dutch Flat School District website is not currently compliant with AB 2257.		Finding
	×	×		Agree with Finding
				Disagree Partially with Finding
				Disagree Completely with Finding
				Did Not Respond
There was no recommendation associated with this finding.	R8: Bowman Charter School District will update their website to be compliant with AB 2257 by September 1, 2021.	R7: Alta-Dutch Flat School District will update their website to be compliant with AB 2257 by September 1, 2021.	R6: Placer County Board of Supervisors will provide an updated timeline for the Tahoe Justice Center Construction by September 1, 2021.	Recommendation
	×	×	×	Agree with Recommendation
	×	×	×	Implemented Recommendation
				Will be Implemented with Date
				Further Study Needed
				Funding Needed
				Do Not Agree
				Will Not Implement
	Bowman Charter School District provided a compliant response and has implemented the recommendation.	Alta-Dutch Flat School District provided a compliant response and has implemented the recommendation.	Placer County Board of Supervisors provided a compliant response, advising that the recommendation was implemented on June 22, 2021, when the Board of Supervisors approved the Facilities Capital Improvement Plan for the Tahoe Justice Center: Targeted completion date is May, 2026.	Response

Conclusion

The 2021-2022 Placer County Grand Jury is following the precedent set by the 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury by publishing this continuity report. This jury believes it is important to verify that respondents were compliant with Penal Code § 933.05 and concludes that this work is too important to not be a requirement of each grand jury going forward.

Findings

The grand jury found:

- **F1:** Placer County Grand Jury wrote its first continuity report in 2020-2021 and is continuing that process this year, following up on noncompliant responses.
- **F2:** Newcastle Fire Protection District does not have clickable links on its website to their current agenda, making it noncompliant with the Brown Act.
- F3: Midway Heights Water District, Penryn Fire District, and Placer Hills Fire District all have links to their agendas, but the agendas posted are not current. This is noncompliant with the Brown Act.
- **F4:** The Placer County Sheriff's Office response to the grand jury's report on continuity and accountability was noncompliant with Penal Code § 933.05. While the response indicated that the recommendation would be implemented in the future, no timeline for implementation was provided.
- F5: Heather Glen Community Services District, Talmont Resort Improvement District, and the City of Lincoln did not provide responses that were compliant with Penal Code § 933.05. The response provided by these entities did not indicate agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings.
- **F6:** Auburn Recreation & Parks District did not provide a response that was compliant with Penal Code § 933.05. The response provided did not indicate agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings, nor did it provide any response to the recommendation.

Recommendations

The grand jury recommends:

- **R1:** By the time of each year's grand jury final report preparation, future Placer County Grand Juries shall continue to produce a continuity report each year. The grand jury shall follow up with any response that is not compliant with Penal Code § 933.05 and require an updated compliant response.
- **R2:** By November 1, 2022, Newcastle Fire Protection District will insert on their website clickable links to their current agenda.
- **R3:** By September 1, 2022, Midway Heights Water District, Penryn Fire District and Placer Hills Fire District will all update their agenda links to include current agendas.
- **R4:** By September 1, 2022, the Placer County Sheriff's Office will provide an updated response to the recommendations from the 2019-2020 grand jury report, indicating a timeline for implementation in compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.
- R5: By September 1, 2022, Heather Glen Community Services District and Talmont Resort Improvement District will provide updated responses to the recommendations from the 2020-2021 grand jury report, indicating agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings in compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.
- **R6:** By October 1, 2022, the City of Lincoln will provide an updated response to the recommendations from the 2020-2021 grand jury report, indicating agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings in compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.
- **R7:** By September 1, 2022, Auburn Recreation & Parks District will provide an updated response to the recommendations from the 2020-2021 grand jury report, indicating agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings and a response to the pertinent recommendations in compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.

.

Request for Response
Pursuant to Penal Code § 933.05, the Placer County Grand Jury requests a response from the following:

	Recommendations Requiring Response	Response <u>Due Date</u>
William Kahrl Chairperson Newcastle Fire Protection District P.O. Box 262 Newcastle, CA 95658	R2	September 1, 2022
David Wiltsee President Midway Heights County Water District P.O. Box 596 Meadow Vista, CA 95722	R3 2	September 1, 2022
Cheryl Hotaling Chairperson Penryn Fire Protection District 7206 Church St Penryn, CA 95663	R3	September 1, 2022
Peter Hills President Placer Hills Fire Protection District P.O. Box 350 Meadow Vista, CA 95722	R3	September 1, 2022
Devon Bell Sheriff Placer County Sheriff's Office 2929 Richardson Dr Auburn, CA 95603	R4	September 1, 2022
Jim Henderson President Talmont Resort Improvement District P.O. Box 1294 Tahoe City, CA 96145	R5	September 1, 2022

Max Bailey R5 September 1, 2022

President

Heather Glen Community Services District P.O. Box 715 Applegate, CA 95703

Sean Scully R6 October 1, 2022

City Manager City of Lincoln 600 Sixth Street Lincoln, CA 95648

Gordon Ainsleigh R7 September 1, 2022

Chairperson

Auburn Area Recreation & Park District 471 Maidu Dr #200 Auburn, CA 95603

Copies Sent to:

Cindy Gustafson ChairpersonPlacer County Board o

Placer County Board of Supervisors 175 Fulweiler Ave Auburn, CA 95603